

The Inquisition.

A

LETTER

ADDRESSED TO THE HONOURABLE

Sir JOHN COX HIPPISEY, Bt. M. P.

RECORDER OF SUDBURY, &c. &c. &c.

BY A

ROMAN CATHOLIC BISHOP

*Si Inimicus meus maledixisset mihi sustinuissem utique :
tu vero homo unanims, &c.—Ps. liv.*

DUBLIN :

PRINTED BY R. COYNE, 16, PARLIAMENT-STREET

1816.

DA913

.I3x

228

THE INQUISITION, &c.

AMONG the wonderful things of the present wonderful times, may justly be reckoned that Dr. Duigenan, who was in the receipt of £18,000 per ann. to exterminate the Catholic Religion in Ireland, should himself have died a convert to it,* and that Sir J. C. Hippisley, Bart. who is said to have spent £60,000 in promoting the Catholic Cause, as it is called, should now stand forward as the Persecutor of that cause, nay, as the Grand Inquisitor against it. I know, Sir, that you will deny yourself to be a persecutor of our religion; on the contrary you will maintain that your laboured Inquisition is intended ultimately to serve it: still you must allow, Sir John, the truth of the vulgar axiom, that *the person who wears the shoe knows best where it pinches*; in other words, that Catholics, who are the subject of your long threatened Inquisition and Reformation, are the best judges whether these are of a beneficent or a persecuting nature in

A 2

* It is credibly reported that the Doctor gave signs, at least, of his wish to return to his original faith; as his parents certainly did return to it previously to their dissolution.

their regard. You have long since lost the confidential correspondence and friendship of your original friends, the Catholic Bishops of Ireland and of other countries; but now the lay Catholic Board has taken its agency out of your hands, and turned its back upon you: and even the learned Counsellor, Mr. C. B. who publicly termed you ONE OF US, and who styled your printed Speech: **THE INVALUABLE WORK OF OUR INVALUABLE FRIEND, SIR JOHN HIPPISEY**, is understood to blame your conduct, and to throw a veil over his connexions with you: Whence, Honored Sir, has this change in your dispositions and conduct proceeded? Not from a desire of the emoluments, which may eventually be annexed to the office of Grand Inquisitor; since you have already spent on the Catholic cause more than ten times the calculated amount of such annual emoluments. Not from the *Amor Patriæ*; since she has more than once, by her accredited organ, rather roughly rejected your offer of so serving her; particularly on the last occasion; when the question was about *interpreting Bellarmin, and consulting your Boxes of books on the Table and those under the Table*. Nor is your motive the *laudum immensa cupido*: for what credit could you gain in weighing the merits of poor Irish Priests, as candidates for Catholic Episcopacy, one against another, and by reading over dull Latin Epistles to and from Rome, concerning impediments and irregularities, and rites and ceremonies; you that have acted so brilliant a part at Bristol, on the Temple Benches, in the East Indies, at Rome, in South America, at Wirtemberg, and at home?

But whatever your influencing motive may be, in urging your proposed temporary Inquisition, for the purpose of establishing another permanent Inquisition, you are labouring to produce a great deal of private inconvenience and pain, and of public acrimony and confusion; besides the additional odium you thereby draw upon yourself. To prevent all this mischief, methinks, Sir, I can in a few pages give you all the essential information you want to draw from the different persons you would probably call before you, with all of whom I am perfectly well acquainted: therefore let us first call for

DR. TROY.

Sir John Hippisley. I am glad Dr. Troy to form a personal acquaintance with you, after so long a correspondence by letters which I formerly held with you. You are, I believe, the Catholic Archbishop of Dublin.—Dr. Troy. I am so acknowledged in every part of the Catholic Church: but I have no rank, dignity or authority, according to the laws of this realm.

Sir J. What objection then have you Catholic Prelates to exchange your titles for others which shall prevent your standing in a state of rivalry with the established Bishops of the realm; so that you, for example, should become the Bishop of Swords instead of Dublin, and Dr. Reilly Bishop of Drogheda instead of Armagh? At any rate cannot the legislative power of the kingdom make the changes in question, consistently with the doctrine and discipline of

the Catholic Church?---Dr. T. We Prelates are not competent to make these changes; nor is the legislative power competent to make them, consistently with our faith and essential discipline. It was in resisting an attempt of this nature, on the part of their National Assembly that the Clergy of France, to the number of 60,000, suffered martyrdom or exile about 25 years ago. On the other hand, we Catholic Prelates have not set ourselves up in opposition to the established Clergy, as we existed a long time before them, and as our jurisdiction is chiefly employed about spiritual matters in which they do not claim any jurisdiction at all.

Sir J. But to proceed to the principal object of my inquiries: is there any and what objection, on Catholic grounds, to his Majesty's appointing, directly or indirectly, your Bishops, in the same manner as he appoints those of the Establishment?---Dr. T. It is certain, 1st, that the King cannot directly and properly nominate to our Bishoprics or other spiritual charges without *acknowledging himself to be a Roman Catholic*, [in which light neither he nor you wish him to be considered] for the nominator, *eo. ipso*, gives testimony, *in the name of the Catholic Church*, to the sacerdotal merits of the episcopal candidate, and, in the very first place, as to his *orthodoxy in the true Roman Catholic Faith*, which implies that his Majesty would *acknowledge this faith to be true and himself to be a member of it*. 2dly, His Majesty, *as such*, evidently can have no greater authority in matters of this sort than his Pagan ancestors, Hengist and Horsa, nay than the persecutors, Nero and Domitian had.

Sir J. Have not all the sovereigns and states

throughout Europe and throughout the world, whether Catholic or Protestant, Greek or Infidel, the right of appointing Bishops in their respective dominions?---Dr. T. To understand this matter thoroughly, several distinctions and much elucidation is necessary. If the Catholic sovereigns of France, Spain, and Portugal, for example, have been accustomed to nominate to the Bishoprics in their respective dominions, in the name of the clergy and people, as was the original discipline, or instead of the Diocesan Clergy or the Cathedral Clergy, as was the subsequent discipline, this has taken place *in virtue of a Concordatum*, or *positive grant* of the Church to this effect: such as never was granted nor ever can be granted to a Sovereign who openly professes an opposite, or even a different faith from hers. In the next place, I must observe, that far the greater part of the Catholic Bishops throughout the world [to say nothing of the numberless Nestorian, Eutychian, Armenian, and Coptic Bishops, who are really and truly Bishops] from the borders of Hungary to the extremity of China, throughout North America, in many parts of Germany, Poland, &c. are appointed without the interference of the civil power, any more than it has hitherto interfered in the appointment of Irish or English Catholic Prelates, or of other Bishops or pretended Bishops in this realm, who do not belong to its established religion.

Sir J. You will allow, at least, that the King of Prussia, who is a Protestant, and the Emperor of Russia, who is of the Greek Church, appoint the Catholic Bishops in their respective dominions.—Dr. T. I must deny this assertion:

because it is a fact which I have ascertained, that when the Great Frederick became sovereign of Catholic Silesia, he applied to the immortal Benedict XIV, requesting to have the same authority in the appointment of Catholic Bishops in that country which the Catholic Emperor of Germany had hitherto held, and that the Pope answered him that the thing was "unexampled in the history of the Church, and that if he were to set the first example of it, besides the punishment he should incur in a future state, his name would become infamous in this, till the end of time." I grant that when a candidate for Episcopacy is freely chosen by the Catholic Clergy whether of Prussia or Russia, and, when these certify among other things, that he is not objected to by the Sovereign, the Pope is accustomed to give him his spiritual powers; but, observe, that his Holiness neither does nor ever will tie himself up from rejecting such a postulation, [in case of no canonical impediment being proved] in the manner he does in his Concordats with Catholic powers. Besides all this, there are several circumstances which render the situation of Russia and Prussia different from that of Ireland with respect to the choice of Catholic Bishops, &c.

Sir J. What are these circumstances?—Dr. T. I will mention some of them, 1st, The Bishoprics of Silesia and Poland are rich and powerful principalities, of which the Sovereign is the Patron and Lord Paramount, whereas my situation is not endowed with a single shilling; and if I or any other person were to give out of his private property a single shilling to endow it, the same would be forfeited by law. 2dly, It

may be judged from the above mentioned, and from numberless other instances, that the Catholic Religion is effectually supported and cherished in those foreign states, which I should be glad to affirm with respect to my native island. 3dly, Those are **DESPOTIC STATES**; whereas ours is a **FREE STATE**, particularly in what regards religion; insomuch that the Legislature does not think it prudent, even in cases of urgent necessity, as has appeared in recent cases, to interfere in the œconomy of any religious society, which it does not support; and I hope, Sir John, that it may not now for your particular purposes, set an example of this interference with respect to the Catholics, which, besides the dreadful irritation that it is sure to cause in Ireland, may perhaps alarm some of the Dissenters in England.

Sir J. What are those recent cases you allude to, in which the Legislature did not dare to interfere with the religious liberty of the Dissenters?---Dr. T. It will be sufficient to mention the fate of Lord Sidmouth's Bill, three or four years ago, which, as I understand, went no farther than to prevent chimney-sweepers and other utterly illiterate people from becoming preachers of the Gospel upon their paying a shilling for a licence. The bill, I believe, barely required them to *sign their names* to their petitions for such licences, in order to prove that they could read and write; yet so great a clamour was raised throughout Britain against this very moderate *Veto*, and the tables of Parliament were heaped so high with petitions against it, as an invasion of religious freedom, that the noble author of the bill was forced hastily to withdraw.

it. In short, it is notorious that not one of the numberless descriptions of Dissenters who overspread these islands, does or will submit to any species of regal *Veto* whatever on the appointment of their respective pastors. Why then should you, Sir John, single out the unoffending Catholics to be deprived of their religious liberty, and to be shackled in this manner?

Sir J. I will assign a sufficient reason for the difference in question: you Catholic Bishops have intimate connexions with foreign prelates, and particularly with the Pope; while none of those Dissenters have either Bishops or foreign connexions.---Dr. T. Pardon me, Sir John, the Moravians, who are the fathers of the Methodists, have numerous Bishops in England, and those appointed by the elders of Hornhuth, in Moravia. The late Mr. J. Wesley consecrated Dr. Coke and others, Bishops and Priests, who, in their turn, have consecrated several others for different countries and connexions; these, as also the Russian clergy, the Quakers, the Jews, and several other religionists keep up a close connexion with their brethren in foreign parts, and are, in many instances dependent upon them. Hence your alledged reason for shackling us, whose loyalty and conduct you have so highly extolled, falls to the ground.

Sir J. But, after all, did not you yourself, with nine other Catholic prelates, in the year 1799, sign that "it was reasonable his Majesty should have a power of interfering in the appointment of Catholic prelates in Ireland?"

---Dr. T. I grant that just as the *Legislative Union* was on the point of taking place, at a time when our laity were led to believe them-

selves to be on the very threshold of complete emancipation; and when we Prelates and Clergy were industriously fed with the hopes of seeing the Catholic religion cherished, honoured, and placed nearly on the same footing in Ireland that Presbyterianism is upon in Scotland, some ten of us being assembled upon other business in Dublin, were induced to give an opinion favourable to a limited interference of the Crown in the appointment of our Bishops; but when nine years had passed away without our expectations being fulfilled in the smallest degree, and when every circumstance, but more particularly the proposed measure seemed to threaten the undermining of our religion, being *all of us* assembled together on this very business, we deliberately and unanimously resolved, that it was inexpedient to make any change in the existing discipline as to this point; which resolution we have ever since supported and mean to support.

Sir J. Will you support it in opposition to the See of Rome?—Dr. T. We trust that no such opposition between that See and us will ever take place, whatever undue means some persons may employ to create it. After all we, who have divine jurisdiction in our Church, and the power of consecration in our hands, must be parties to any such change as that in question, should it, in different circumstances, ever take place.

Sir J. In the Synod you have alluded to, Sept. 14, 1808, you likewise voted against accepting of the state pensions which I offered you in my printed *Sketch of a Bill*: why did you reject these?—Dr. T. For the opposite reason to

yours, Sir John, in making the offer: namely, in the exercise of our ministry we wish not to be dependent or under any undue influence.

Sir J. As you mention influence, I must plainly tell you that you Bishops and Priests possess a great deal too much of it over your people; and that it is necessary to destroy or greatly weaken this for the safety and peace of Ireland.

—Dr. T. A Clergy without influence is not fit for its station. I suppose the clergy of other communions, and particularly the Methodist Preachers, have a great deal of ascendancy over the minds of their hearers, by the sums of money they draw from them. The question for a politician is to what evil purposes the influence of the different descriptions of Clergymen is directed, good or bad; and from this inquiry, we Catholic Bishops and Priests of Ireland will not flinch. Our lessons inculcate the purest morality and the most steadfast loyalty to the Sovereign and his representatives, let their religion be what it may: and our conduct in times of danger, whether from internal commotion, among an irritated people, or of hostile invasion, by an enemy, who carried the Palladium of Religious freedom on the prows of his vessels, has been such, in point of loyalty and patriotism, as never was surpassed, if it was ever equalled, by Bishops and Clergy, in any age or country. On both the occasions alluded to we did not slink into ambiguous obscurity, but we ran through the ranks of our flocks to confirm the well-disposed and to reclaim the misguided; and this at the risk of our popularity, our property and our lives. How often have I myself been warmly thanked by his Majesty's Ministers for my conduct during the

Rebellion! What well earned honours were not conferred by Protestant Corporations as well as by the Lord Lieutenant, on your old friend, Bishop Moylan of Cork, for preserving the peace and tranquillity of the Catholics in the South, when Hoche's fleet suddenly appeared on their coast! He went so far as to give his own cash and to borrow money from all his rich friends, in order to pay his Majesty's troops at a critical moment when Bank Notes were waste paper. More recently Bishop Power of Waterford, by his pastoral exertions, put an end to the sanguinary contests between the *Caravatts* and the *Shanavests*, when every other means of quieting them had failed. Thus we have acted and thus we shall continue to act, because it is our duty so to act; and we have solemnly resolved, on the above-mentioned occasion, and are ready to confirm with our oath, [that oath which you, Sir John, have often mentioned, as the *greatest security* which one man can receive from another] that we, [who must know our Clergy better than it is possible for his Majesty's Ministers to know them] "will choose no person for the rank " and dignity of a Catholic Bishop but such as " we know to be of unimpeachable loyalty and " peaceable conduct."—If the *mere possession* of influence, and the *possibility* of abusing it, alarms your jealousy; you ought to put a *Veto* on wealth, dignity and talents, all of which, and particularly the first mentioned, commands much more influence than Religion in every Society.

Sir J. I must not forget the essential article in my *Sketch of a Bill* respecting a new office to be created for revising all the correspondence of your Clergy with foreign Clergy, and particu-

larly with the See of Rome: would it be contrary to your essential discipline to submit to this restriction? In fact the restriction subsists in every Catholic state in Europe.—Dr. T. You have been very unfortunate, Sir, in the selection of the Divines you quote in your publications, most of whom are notoriously heterodox, and particularly in that of the practices you refer to, most of which are corrupt and oppressive. It is not enough to shew that such and such despotic courts have issued such and such ordinances, by means of Jansenist or Infidel Ministers, or even that these have been acted upon, in order to prove what is our discipline: you ought, for your purpose, to prove that the Church has approved of such ordinances: now, to my certain knowledge, the Pope *never will consent to the opening of his letters* by any one, but the person to whom they are sent; and though these are all as innocent as those which you, Sir, have been in the habit of receiving from the same quarter, they are mostly of such a nature that we could not, in honour or conscience, expose them to a public office. In a word, Sir John, the whole plan of these restrictive articles seems *intended to cut out work for the proposed New Office*, whoever is to fill it: in the mean time if they were enacted, as proposed in a late Bill, [which you describe as stolen out of *your Boxes*] they would destroy the confidence of correspondence, would injure commerce, and deprive British subjects of their constitutional right of *Habeas Corpus*. Government has the same remedies against treasonable correspondence, on our part, that it has

against the same crime among subjects of every description.

DR. MILNER.

Sir J. Have you brought with you that letter of Cardinal Borgia, concerning a Royal interference on the appointment of Bishops in this kingdom, which you were ordered to bring?—Dr. M. I never received a letter from Cardinal Borgia on the subject. But to deal plainly with you, Sir John, I received an answer to some questions which I proposed on that subject from Monsig. Coppola, Secretary of the Propaganda, some nine or ten years ago; that letter I have more than once hunted for in vain among my papers, [since I found you were taking such great pains to get possession of it] in order to destroy it. I believe I lost it when I went to Ireland in 1808.

Sir J. Why did you want to keep it out of my hands?—Dr. M. Because my ideas are different from yours, respecting confidential correspondence. I never publish the private letters of my friends without their consent, expressed by words or implied by actions.

Sir J. What was the tenor of those letters?—Dr. M. I cannot, at this distance of time, give any accurate account of their contents; but I recollect in general that they were decidedly hostile to a Royal interference, and to that of our accepting of state-pensions.

Sir J. Have not all the states of Europe laid certain restraints on the Pope's appointment of Bishops in their respective dominions? And did not our ancestors, in Catholic times,

impose similar restrictions on his power in this country?---Dr. M. My friend Dr. T. has fully answered your former question. In reply to your latter: I answer that English Bishoprics, in former times, were what they are now, rich benefices, founded, for the most part, by our Sovereigns, and entitling their possessors to seats in Parliament and great temporal power: hence there was abundant reason for restraining the Pope from nominating foreigners to them, and from having the uncontrolled patronage of them: the case however is, *toto cœlo*, different with respect to our present English and Irish Prelacies, which consist in nothing else but spiritual jurisdiction in the concerns of the Catholic Religion.

Sir J. Did not you authorize a Right Hon. Member to offer a Veto to Government in the name of the Irish Prelates? And did not you yourself consent to this measure during the whole time that you and I were acquainted together?---Dr. M. I never did authorize that personage or any other to make such a proposal; nor did I previously know that any such proposal would be made: I barely answered the questions put to me, as to the dispositions of the Prelates, according to the best of my opinion, though this opinion proved, in the end, be erroneous. With respect to myself, I thought, for a considerable time, that all parties might be reconciled without our religion being exposed to any danger, if the Crown were allowed the power of objecting to a small number of Episcopal Candidates, upon **AVOWED CIVIL GROUNDS**, namely, those of *disloyalty or sedition*. In conclusion, however, it appeared that the Irish Pre-

lates and Catholics would agree to no concessions at all in this matter, and that all the Protestant politicians insisted on possessing the power of rejecting our candidates upon any ground they pleased. In addition to this, you, Sir John, positively required our consent to the creation of your favourite office of *Ministre du Culte Catholique*. To this proposal, I said that “ I would rather be led into the neighbouring square, to suffer instant death, than consent to it,” when you replied: “ Then we are at issue.”

Sir J. Some time after this, you published a book against me.—Dr. M. I examined and refuted the theological arguments detailed in your *Letters to Lord Fingal*, and in one of your printed speeches: in return, you published, in the newspapers, extracts of my private letters to you, written during the time of our friendship; which publication I have not hitherto answered, either by printing your voluminous letters to me, or in any other way.

Sir J. Setting arguments aside: I wish to ask you whether the facts stated in your *Pastoral Charge, Part I.* are all true? And whether there is any untruth in the comments I have made on your letters?—Dr. M. There is not the least falsehood asserted or insinuated in the abovementioned or any other of my writings, which directly or indirectly relate to my controversies with you: although some respectable Catholics, who have little or no information concerning the facts in question, have in the most solemn manner, and deeds of the utmost importance, charged me with *falsehood and calumny in your regard*. May they live to re-

pent! As to your comments on my letters to you, there is much falsehood or misrepresentation in them.

Sir J. Mention any instances of this nature. Dr. M. I will state two instances. You insinuate at the beginning of your publication, that you were the instrument of raising me to the rank of a Bishop, just as you have said that you made Monsigr. E——ne a Cardinal. The fact is, I was nominated in the regular way by the senior Visc. Ap. with the approbation of the other V. V. A. True it is, that you forwarded for me to an eminent person at Rome, a long letter; but this related to matters of a very different nature from that of my promotion; concerning which, you know, Sir, that I never hinted a desire of your interest or interference, nor do I know that you ever employed any. Besides, I can shew that the date of my appointment precedes that of the letter in question, and therefore of any letter from you, which, without my knowledge, may have accompanied it. Yet, notwithstanding this, the respectable persons alluded to in the circumstances described, have asserted that I *solicited you to employ your interest with persons in power at Rome, to get myself appointed to my present rank and my present office!* May they live to repent! Another instance of your misrepresenting me in the newspapers, and afterwards in a pamphlet, occurs where you state, that, notwithstanding my present contempt of money, *there was a time when I solicited government for it.* The fact is, and you know it, that I was persuaded by a noble personage to present a memorial to a near relative of his, high in office, re-

presenting the loss of colleges which the officiating Catholic Clergy in England had suffered, *precisely because they were English*, by the French revolution, and our want of means to furnish the necessary supply of Clergymen for our Chapels. This I did with the knowledge and concurrence of my brethren. In short, had the memorial succeeded, I should not have gained a shilling by it for myself; and if you, Sir, had been candid enough to publish my letter, in which I informed you of this business, among my other letters, you would not have been able to misrepresent me in this affair as you have done.

THE REV. JOHN BROWNE.

Sir J. You are, I understand, a Priest, educated at Stonyhurst establishment: are you also a Jesuit?—Mr. B. No, Sir.

Sir J. What is the nature of that establishment?—Mr. B. It is a College for the education of Catholic young gentlemen, similar to that which you have sometimes honoured with your company. It is presumed you are not altogether unacquainted with Stonyhurst, as a few years ago you made a handsome present to purchase philosophical instruments for the advancement of literature there.

Sir J. You speak of its students; but are not the superiors and masters of it, members of that illegal, infamous Society of Jesuits? Are they not bound by its vows, subject to its exercises, and guided by its maxims?—Mr. B. If any of them have made religious vows, of whatsoever kind, they are of the most private na-

ture, and merely conscientious, not being sanctioned by the laws of the country. Such vows, I must observe to you, Sir, have been made by numerous Catholic individuals of both sexes in every age and country: for example, under Queen Elizabeth and under Nero, without the cognizance or the violation of the public laws. In like manner, there is nothing illegal or immoral in certain persons of either sex living and saying their prayers together, as suits their convenience and inclinations, for such time as this inclination continues; being all sensible that their union, by the laws of their country, can continue no longer.

Sir J. But to speak of the maxims of the Jesuits: do not these sanction the deposing of kings and killing them; as also lying, perjury, and in short every crime which they think can contribute to the advancement of the Catholic Religion or of their own order? As to their practices, have they not caused confusion and ruin in every country into which they have been admitted?—Mr. B. The Jesuits, to my certain knowledge, every where, abhor and abjure all the crimes you mention. If you imagine the Divines of Stonyhurst belong to this Society, send for their dictates or theological class books, as you did for those of Maynooth: you will be satisfied, that there at least, none but the purest doctrines, civil as well as religious, are taught; and, if you honour them with a visit, you will soon be convinced, that as warm a love of their king and country pervades every breast at Stonyhurst, as in any society within the realm. The Jesuits have not disturbed the peace of any country, but have

restored that of several states, and have promoted morality, literature, and the arts, in them all. They have civilized as well as converted many barbarous nations, and are, by profession, devoted to do good to all mankind. Their best recommendation is that they were the first and principal objects of hatred and persecution to the pretended philosophers who have, of late years, destroyed the peace, the government, and the religion of the world.

THE REV. DOM. ANTHONY.

Sir J. Do you belong to the monastery of La Trappe?—D. A. I am aware that by the laws of this country no monastery can exist in it. If the common people call our poor mud walls a monastery, and say that it belongs to the society of La Trappe, they are mistaken in both particulars.

Sir J. What is the nature of your society in Dorsetshire? D. A. We are a small association of Catholics, chiefly French, addicted to solitude, silence, abstinence, manual labour, contemplation, and prayer, in which latter exercises we pass a great many hours of the day. We hold as little converse as possible with the few peasants who dwell on the same solitary coast with ourselves, and therefore do not unsettle their established creed. We do not keep schools, though sometimes we have instructed a few Catholic children, at the request of their indigent parents. Every individual of the society is at full liberty to quit it whenever he pleases.

Sir J. Several grievous charges have been laid against you of late.—D. A. It is true that an unfortunate individual who left us who misbehaved, who then, on his knees, begged to rejoin us again, and afterwards again abandoned us, together with the Catholic religion, has deposed the most absurd as well as the most horrid crimes against us; but I have proofs in my hands to refute all and every one of his charges, if the justice, or rather the humanity of this country, will enter into a particular enquiry upon each of them. They will all be found as false as a former charge was, of our harbouring Bonaparte; in consequence of which our cottages were strictly searched by constables and magistrates.* I know that a prejudice has been lately excited against us, but it is unworthy the humanity and good sense of this renowned nation to cherish it when the grounds of it are done away. In case, however, our respectable neighbours shall envy us our mud walls and potatoe garden, which are the principal means of our subsistence, the inevitable consequence will be, that several aged and infirm persons must starve under the hedges, having no money nor any parishes; and that a few of us must go and try the humanity of the savages near the Ohio, in North America, in quest of

* At the time here spoken of, the same absurd report of the concealment of Bonaparte was raised against a society of emigrant ladies in Wiltshire. Their house was accordingly searched by constables and magistrates. The Superior, Mrs. J——, behaved with the greatest composure on the occasion; saying to the intruders: *Gentlemen, I am not surprised that you should search my house in England for Bonaparte, since, when I was at Paris, my house was there searched for Mr. Pitt.*

solitude and vegetables.—Sir J. Dom. Anthony, you are at liberty to retire.

And now, Sir John Hippisley, if you have any more inquiries to make for the purpose of establishing your Inquisition and Reformation, I am ready to produce the necessary evidence, who am your humble servant,

A CATHOLIC CHRISTIAN.

FINIS.

... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

